DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 681 JC 800 333

AUTHOR Padgett, Suzanne: Thompson, Larry C.
TITLE A Survey of Professional Development in Arizona Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION Arizona Univ., Tucson. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty: *Community Colleges: Compensation (Remuneration): *Faculty Development: Financial Support: *Inservice Education: Professional Development: *Program Administration: State Surveys: Teacher Motivation: Teacher Participation: Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

In order to identify and describe the professional development programs available at the community colleges in Arizona, the administrators of the faculty development programs at each of the state's 20 campuses were mailed a brief questionnaire: 18 questionnaires were returned. The survey revealed that there were over 2,000 faculty members at these colleges, with an average of 109 instructors per institution. Of the 18 responding colleges, 15 offered some sort of professional development program and all but one of these colleges had developed stated program goals. The average community college offered nine separate professional development experiences--the most commonly offered were workshops, professional leaves, orientation, seminars, consultant programs, and funding of travel. The direction and implementation of these programs were in the hands of individuals or groups in a number of different positions. In response to a question on program funding, one respondent indicated that his/her college's program was funded through federal grants, three indicated having state support, and seven indicated that their programs were operated on local district funds. Program participation was reported to be "strictly voluntary" at 13 colleges and the most frequently mentioned type of remuneration for this participation was salary or grade increments. The questionnaire is included. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188681

A SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN ARIZONA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Prepared by:

Suzanne Padgett,
University of Arizona
Larry C. Thompson, Ph.D.
Pima Community College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Suzanne Padgett
Larry C. Thompson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 800 333

INTRODUCTION

The community college is a relative newcomer to the field of post-secondary education. As a comparative youngster, it has not yet acquired the systems and traditions of older senior colleges and universities. Consequently, many of its policies and procedures are still being defined and established.

Arizona's community college system, like others, has been characterized by rapid growth and a lack of uniform, formalized procedures. One area in which this lack is evident is professional development. However, educators from across the state are meeting as a consortium to identify the weaknesses and strengths of current faculty development programs and are working together to provide directed professional growth for the future.

In the face of limited or non-existent information about the various development programs now in practice in Arizona, the researchers, in April 1979, devised a brief questionnaire in an attempt to identify and describe those professional development programs then available in community colleges. The intent was to present an integrated perspective of what was occuring in existing programs and to outline possible directions for subsequent growth. The results of this questionnaire were presented to the consortium as background information for planning purposes and were distributed statewide afterward.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As an institution matures and establishes itself in the traditions and systems of post-secondary education, it begins to evaluate its professional capabilities and to insist on more extensive and

comprehensive programs to maintain its stature and effectiveness. One such program that is now being evaluated in this light is faculty development at community colleges. Having reached a stage of dissatisfaction with existing (or lack of existing) programs, these community colleges are now looking for methods to adapt or supplement their plans. They have been hampered in one respect by relatively little published material on the subject of teacher preparation.

Prihoda (1972) points out that until relatively recently, many community college teachers had been trained for secondary schools and that junior colleges were considered to be extended high schools. Brawer (1973) states that, prior to the 1960's, preparation for community college teaching followed three major avenues of training: 1. A college degree and secondary school teaching experience; 2. a Master's degree in an academic program; and 3. vocational-technical experience in a specific occupation.

As community colleges expanded in the 1960's and enrollments grew, many instructors were hired who did not have an understanding of the institution's role and purpose. The American Association of Junior Colleges recommended programs for graduates and undergraduates which would prepare them for community college teaching responsibilities. Edmund J. Gleazer, among others, highlighted this problem in writings like <u>This is the Community College</u> (1968).

During the late 1960's and the 1970's, as a result, these community college preparation programs increased dramatically. Spurred by the Education Professions Development Act of 1968, the number of colleges and universities offering courses or programs for community college work increased from 23 in 1954 to more than 200 in 1970 (Cohen and Brawer, 1972). More concern and recommendations continued. Park (1971) suggested active cooperation between teacher training universities and the community colleges where these teachers will work. Bogart (1971) and others looked at the criteria for competent teachers. Also in 1971, the National Advisory Council of Education Professions Development issued a report entitled People for the People's College promoting the idea of in-service training within the community colleges. This report also noted two trends in junior colleges that must be acknowledged. First, enrollment will decline and fewer new teachers will be hired. Second, teachers must meet the needs of an increasingly varied student clientele. Thus, teachers in coming years will need to be more specially and thoroughly prepared.

SURVEY PROCEDURE

This project began by identifying the community colleges in the state by single and multi-campus systems. There are eight single campus colleges and three multi-campus districts with a total of twenty campuses of varying size across the state. Each campus was contacted. The following list identifies the campuses and their locations:

SINGLE CAMPUS COLLEGES

Arizona Western College (Yuma)
Cochise College (Douglas)
College of Ganado (Ganado)
Eastern Arizona College (Thatcher)

Mohave Community (Kingman)
Navajo Community College (Chinle)
Northland-Pioneer College (Holbrook)
Yavapai College (Prescott)

MULTI-CAMPUS DISTRICTS

Maricopa County Community College District:
- Glendale Community College (Glendale)
- Maricopa Technical Community College (Phoenix)
- Mesa Community College (Mesa)
- Phoenix College (Phoenix)
- Scottsdale Community College (Scottsdale)
- Rio Salado Community College (Phoenix)

Pinal County Community College District:
- Arizona College of Technology (Winkleman)
- Central Arizona College (Coolidge)

Pima County Community College District:
- West Campus (Tucson)
- Downtown Campus (Tucson)
- East Education Center (Tucson)
- Community Campus (Tucson/Nogales/Sells/Ajo/Marana)

The Dean of Instruction at each campus was contacted personally by telephone and asked if, at that campus, it was the job of the Dean or a designate to administer the faculty development program at that location. With the receipt of the Dean's or designate's name, a letter and questionnaire (samples attached) were mailed to that person, asking for a brief response in the ten areas indicated. The campus was asked to attach a copy of any statements of goals or plans the school has for faculty development and a copy of the Faculty Handbook. For the purposes of this study, the term "Professional Development" was used, although some institutions might employ another designation, such as "Faculty Development," "Institutional Development," or "Professional Growth."

Most campuses responded quickly and indicated their interest in the project. In all, eighteen of the twenty campuses completed and returned the questionnaire. Item by item discussion of these

results follows.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

The questionnaire utilized in this study (see Appendix B) was sent to the Deans of Instruction, Educational Development Officers, or similar administrators at all community colleges in Arizona. Question #1 asked for the number of instructors who were employed at their institution. The responses ranged from 18 to 434, with an average of 109 instructors per college. It should be noted, however, that some respondents did not distinguish between full and part-time faculty. Nevertheless, it is evident that there are over 2,000 faculty members who are actual or potential participants in professional development activities in this state at the two-year college level.

The next question asked if their college had a professional development program. Fifteen of the responding institutions are currently engaged in professional development programs. For the remainder of this analysis, only those respondents with existing professional development programs will be discussed. It is perhaps significant that all of the respondents who replied negatively to this question indicated a desire to be actively involved in professional development and that they are presently developing professional development programs.

Next, these colleges were asked if they had stated purposes and goals for their programs. All but one of the 15 respondents currently operating professional development programs responded affirmatively to this question.

Table 1 presents a tabulation of the different types of developmental experiences made available by these professional development programs. This tabulation is broken down by institution and by type of development experience.

Perhaps a more useful way to look at these responses is illustrated by the matrix below in which the various types of professional development experiences have been arranged according to frequency of selection into high, middle, and low ranges.

TYPES OF DEVELOPMENTAL EXPERIENCES

Range*	High	Middle	Low
Developmental Experience**	Workshops (13)	Funds (10)	Retreats (3)
	Professional Leave (13)	Division Meetings (9)	Take-home Programs (1)
	Orientation (12)	Faculty Grants (9)	
	Seminars (12)	PD Library (8)	
	Consultants (12)	Graduate Credit (7)	
	Travel (11)	Liaison (6)	
		Videotape (6)	
		Exchange (6)	

*High = 11 responses (75% or more)

Middle = 5 - 10 responses (26-74%)

Low = 4 or fewer responses (25% or less)

**Number of responses in parentheses

Respondents were queried as to the number of different types of experiences which were available. The totals ranged from a high of 14 different types of experiences to a low of 3, with the average community college in Arizona offering 9 separate professional

TABLE 1. TYPES OF DEVELOPMENTAL EXPERIENCES

TOTAL	SCOTTSDALE	RIO SALADO	PIMA WEST CAMPUS	PIMA EAST CENTER	PIMA DOWNTOWN	PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	PHOENIX	NORTHLAND	MESA	MARICOPA	GLENDALE	GANADA	EASTERN	COCHISE	CENTRAL	
12	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	ORIENTATION
12	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	SEMINARS
13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	WORKSHOPS
3				X				X				X				RETREATS
6			X			X	X		X	X		X				LIAISON
9	X		X		X				X	X		X	X	X	X	DIVISION MEETING
1								X								TAKE-HOME PROGRAMS
8			X		X		X	X	X		X	X	X			P D LIBRARY
10	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		FUNDS
6			X				X		X	X	X		X			VIDEOTAPE
7	X		X		X	X	X	X			X					GRADUATE CREDIT
12	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		CONSULTANTS
11			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		TRAVEL
9	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X		X			FACULTY GRANTS
13	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	PROFESSIONAL LEAVE
6			X	X	X	X			X			X				EXCHANGE
	9	3	14	8	11	11	12	11	11	9	10	8	9	7	5	TOTAL

development activities to its personnel.

Respondents were also asked to indicate who directed their professional development programs -- director/coordinator of professional development, dean of instruction, or others. Three professional development programs are administered by directors/coordinators of professional development, and five programs utilize deans of instruction. Seven programs are administered in some other manner, usually through the combination of a coordinator and a professional development committee. In at least two cases, there was a split between district and campus responsibilities with either a professional development specialist at the district level and faculty responsible on campus, or a professional development committee at the district level and faculty or coordinators responsible at the campus level.

The sixth question of the questionnaire dealt with the primary funding of these programs. Respondents indicated whether they received their funds primarily from federal grants, special state funds, local district funds, or regular state funds. One institution's program was funded by money from federal grants, three were primarily supported by regular state funds, and the greatest number, seven programs, were operated on local district funds. None of the respondents utilized special state funds as the major source of funding.

Respondents were requested to indicate the primary reasons for faculty participation in their programs, with the restriction that they check no more than two of the following reasons--strictly voluntary, recommended by administrators, required of all faculty, or attendance as a factor in promotion and retention. Thirteen

institutions indicated that participation was "strictly voluntary." Less than one quarter checked "recommended by administrators," and about the same percentage indicated that participation is required. Perhaps most interestingly, participation in the program was not selected as a factor in either promotion or retention at any of the responding colleges.

In reply to question No. 8 the respondents indicated who conducts or carries out their programs -- top-level administrators, department heads, outside consultants, other faculty members, or other individuals, or combinations of the above. As illustrated by Table #2, a majority indicated faculty as the conductors of their programs, with consultants, department heads, and administrators selected by about one-half of the respondents. It should be noted that faculty were involved in conducting 13 out of the 15 programs, or 80% of the total.

Question No. 9 dealt with the rewards or compensation which were offered to faculty for their involvement in professional growth experiences. Ten types of remuneration were offered by the responding institutions. The most frequently mentioned type of compensation was salary or grade increments; 92% of those respondents who offered compensation did so through this mode.

Grants/project funding, college credit, travel expenses, and stipend/per diem expenses were methods utilized by more than one institution. Other types of rewards were instructional development, sabbatical leaves, released time, professional recognition, and extended contracts. More than half (seven) of those colleges who responded affirmatively to this question compensated participants in their programs through at least two channels or methods. (see

TABLE 2. CONDUCTORS OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

	ADMINIS-TRATION	DEPARTMENT HEADS	CONSULTANTS	FACULTY	OTHER
CENTRAL ARIZONA COLLEGE	X	X		X	
COCHISE COMMUNITY COLLEGE		X		X	
EASTERN ARIZONA COLLEGE	X	X	X	X	
COLLEGE OF GANADO		X	X	X	
GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	X	X	X	X	
MARICOPA TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE		X	X		X
MESA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	X	X	X	X	
NORTH-PIONEER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	X	X		X	
PHOENIX COMMUNITY COLLEGE			X	X	
PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE-COMMUNITY CAMPUS				X	
PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE-DOWNTOWN CAMPUS					X
PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE-EAST EDUCATION CENTER	X		X	X	
PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE-WEST CAMPUS				X	
RIO SALADO COMMUNITY COLLEGE			X	X	
SCOTTSDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	X		X	X	
TOTAL	7	8	9	13	2

TABLE 3.

TYPES OF COMPENSATION

	SALARY/GRADE INCREMENTS	GRANTS/PROJECT FUNDING	COLLEGE CREDIT	TRAVEL	STIPEND/PER DIEM	INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT	SABBATICALS	RELEASED TIME	PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION	EXTENDED CONTRACTS	TOTAL
CENTRAL ARIZONA COLLEGE	X		X								2
COCHISE COMMUNITY COLLEGE				X		X					2
EASTERN ARIZONA COLLEGE	X	X			X						3
COLLEGE OF GANADO	X										1
GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	X	X					X	X	X		5
MARICOPA TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE											-
MESA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	X	X									2
NORTHLAND-PIONEER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	X										1
PHOENIX COMMUNITY COLLEGE	X		X							X	3
PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE-COMMUNITY CAMPUS	X										1
PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE-DOWNTOWN CAMPUS	X										1
PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE-EAST EDUCATION CENTER	X										1
PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE-WEST CAMPUS	X										1
RIO SALADO COMMUNITY COLLEGE											-
SCOTTSDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	X			X	X						3
TOTAL	12	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	

Table 3).

The final request was that the respondents briefly state their concept of professional development. Their major concerns appear to center around three issues and concepts:

1. The desire to upgrade the faculty was very important, as were efforts to improve job performance, including new and continuing responsibilities, and to provide for continued professional growth.

2. Another goal was to improve instruction. This concern included alternative modes of instruction, dealing with non-traditional students, institutional developmental courses/programs, and keeping up with advances in the faculty member's discipline.

3. Another major need was to improve the total effort of the district/college/campus.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During the course of this survey, certain facts became evident. These conclusions and recommendations are presented below.

1. The vast majority of Arizona Community Colleges are currently engaged in some kind of professional development activities.

2. These activities range from extensive to minimal.

3. There is little exchange of information and ideas between community colleges now.

It is the authors' recommendation that there be increased communication and interchange between the professional development programs in the state. One method of achieving such communication is through the formation of a professional development organization. Such a group would benefit not only those colleges already operating professional development programs, but also those institutions in the process of developing such programs.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE LETTER

February 19, 1979

(Dean of Instruction or
Faculty Development Officer)

Dear _____:

Under the auspices of the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona, we are surveying the Faculty Development Programs at Arizona community colleges. As we discussed in our telephone conversation, your campus has been selected as an important resource for our study.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to the address below by April 1, 1979.

Suzanne Padgett
Research Associate
Center for the Study of Higher Education
1415 N. Fremont
Tucson, Arizona 85719

At the conclusion of our study, we will be glad to send you a copy of the results if you desire.

Sincerely,

Suzanne C. Padgett
Larry C. Thompson

APPENDIX B

1. Number of instructors at your institution _____

2. Does your college now have a Professional Development Program?

   yes _____ no _____

3. If yes, do you have a stated purpose and goals for your program?

   yes _____ no _____

4. If yes to No. 2, which of the following development experiences do you offer? Check as many as apply.

   _____ Orientation
   _____ Seminars
   _____ Workshops
   _____ Retreats
   _____ Liaison between departments/disciplines
   _____ Division meetings
   _____ Packaged, Take-Home Professional Development Programs
   _____ Professional Development Library
   _____ Instructional Development Funds
   _____ Videotape Evaluation of Instruction
   _____ Graduate School Credit Programs
   _____ Consultants and Other Outside Resource Persons
   _____ Travel Funds for Faculty Visitations at Other Schools
   _____ Faculty Grants
   _____ Professional Leave Grants
   _____ Exchange Programs
   _____ Other: _____

5. Who administers the Professional Development Program? Check one.

   _____ Director/Coordinator of Professional Development
   _____ Dean of Instruction
   _____ Other: _____

6. How is the Program primarily funded?

   _____ primarily federal grant funds
   _____ primarily special state funds
   _____ primarily local district funds
   _____ primarily regular state funds

7. What are the primary reasons for participation in the Program? Check no more than two.

_____ Strictly voluntary
_____ Recommended by administrators
_____ Required of all faculty
_____ Attendance a factor in promotion and retention

8. Who conducts or carries out the program? Check as many as apply.

_____ Top level administrators
_____ Department heads
_____ Outside consultants
_____ Other Faculty members
_____ Other

9. Do you offer any rewards or compensation for involvement in professional growth experiences? yes _____ no _____ if yes, specify:

_____

10. Briefly state your school's concept of Professional Development.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BERGQUIST, William H. and Steven R. PHILLIPS. "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program." Journal of Higher Education Vol. XLVI, No. 2 (March-April 1975), p. 177.

BIRKHOLZ, J. R. "A Faculty Internship for William Rainey Harper College." ED035407

BLOESSER, Bob et al. "Foothill College Faculty Senate Professional Development Program." ED095951

BRAWER, Florence B. "Community College Teacher Preparation." Change No. 5, 1973, p. 8

BURLINGTON COUNTY COLLEGE. "Development of a College Conducted Faculty Pre-Service Program, 1969-1972 Final Report." Pemberton, N. J., 1962.

CASE, James B. and Al EDSALL. "Innovative Educational Professional Development Program for Nevada Vocational Personnel." ED145220

COHEN, Arthur M. et al. A Constant Variable: New Perspectives on the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

COHEN, Arthur M. and Florence B. BRAWER. Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor.

COHEN, Arthur M. and Florence B. BRAWER. Focus on Learning: Preparing Teachers for the Two-Year College. ED019939

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT Brief for AACJC 1973. ED081411

COOPER, John D. "Professional Development Plan: Lansing Community College, 1976-1977." ED140923

COOPER, John D. and Diane SMOLEN. "Professional Development Plan: Lansing Community College, 1977-1978." ED145920

GARRISON, R. H. Junior College Faculty: Issues and Probelms. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

GILLEY, J. W. and T. A. Tollefson. Products and Productivity: A Perspective on Learning. Durham, N. C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1972.

GLEAZER, Edmund A., Jr. This is the Community College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

GORDON, S. B. and R. B. WHITEFIELD. A Formula for Teacher Preparation. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION. "Committee on Preparation of Junior College Teachers: Master Plan Phase III. Springfield, 1969. ED038122

KELLY, M. F. and J. CONNOLLY. "Orientation for Faculty in Junior Colleges." ED043323

LEFFORGE, O. S. Inservice Training as an Instrument for Change. Gainesville, Florida.: University of Florida, Institute of Higher Education, 1971.

LEWIS, TROY. "Alvin Community College Faculty Professional Development Plan." ED148441

McCLURE, M. L. et al. "A New Program for the Preparation of Junior College Faculty." ED061183

MEDSKER, Leland L. and Dale TILLERY. Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of the Two-Year College. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

MOORE, W., JR. Against the Odds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT. People for the People's Colleges: Community Junior College Staff Development. Priorities for the 70's. Washington, D.C., 1971.

PARK, Y. "Teacher Preparation Programs in the Junior College." ED045073

O'BANION, Terry. "Staff Development: Priorities for the Seventies." Community and Junior College Journal Vol. 43, No. 2, 1972, p. 10.

PRIHODA, J. Assessing Selected Outcomes of a Junior College Teacher Preparation Program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, UCLA, 1972.

ROGERS, I. L. The Improvement of Instruction in Developing Junior Colleges. Henderson, Tenn.: Freed-Hardeman College, 1971.

SIMERLY, ROBERT. "Faculty Development: Planning for the Effective Use of Human Resources." ED125521

SOULIER, J. Steven. "A Description of a Conceptual Model of Institutional Renewal." ED122855

WARD, John G. "Faculty Development at Oregon Institute of Technology." ED130699

WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER COLLEGE. "Faculty Orientation for a New Community College." ED020717

ZION, C. and C. SUTTON. "Integrated In-Service Development, "New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1973, p. 41

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
JUL 25 1980